

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending herein.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The USPTO respectfully rejects claims 1-4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Young (U.S. Patent No. 6,561,640) ("Young").

Young discloses partially curing the substance by irradiating the substance, and then further completing the curing of the substance (see Fig. 2 at element 140 which partially cures the substance and element 150 which completely cures the substance). Therefore, curing with ultraviolet light is conducted for a plurality of times, with a plurality of irradiating devices.

However, the claimed ultraviolet ray irradiating device of the amended claim 1 is provided with a plurality of ultraviolet ray sources, respectively emitting a plurality of ultraviolet rays of a plurality of light emitting wavelength peaks different from one another. Therefore, the presently claimed invention has an aspect different than Young.

This is a difference that matters because the present invention -- by providing to one single ultraviolet ray irradiating device -- a plurality of ultraviolet ray sources respectively emitting a plurality of ultraviolet rays of a plurality of light emitting wavelength peaks different from one another, enables ink of all colors to be cured effectively in a short time by the irradiation.

Young does not disclose nor suggest using an ultraviolet ray irradiating device provided with a plurality of ultraviolet ray sources respectively emitting a plurality of ultraviolet rays of a plurality of light emitting wavelength peaks different from one another.

Therefore, claim 1 and the claims dependant therefrom are respectfully asserted to be allowable.

Additionally, the Examiner respectfully admits at page 3 that all of the limitations of the claims are not specifically taught by Young and instead relies on an optimum range argument. However, claim 1 does not have or claim ranges, so an optimum range argument does not apply. Therefore, as all of the limitations of the claims are not taught by

KOY-0025
10/731,278

4

the reference *as the Examiner admits*, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not established as required by 35 USC §103. There is also no reasonable expectation of success discussed as required. See MPEP 706.02(j) wherein it is stated that:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In *re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP § 2143 - § 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria."

Applicants also respectfully seasonably challenge the statement of the Examiner's own personal technical knowledge that it would be a matter of optimizing ranges to suggest the present claims as obvious. See MPEP 2144.03. Therefore, applicants respectfully require that a reference be provided to support the Examiner's technical reasoning.

The USPTO also respectfully rejects dependent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Iwasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,626,517) ("Iwasaki").

Iwasaki does not make up for the deficiencies of Young as discussed above.

Also, the inventor notes that Iwasaki also does not disclose of curing ultraviolet ray curable ink for ink jet by an ultraviolet ray. Therefore, it does not disclose the structure of the present invention and is not related.

KOY-0025
10/731,278

5

The USPTO respectfully rejects dependent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Mitani (U.S. Patent No. 5,666,140) ("Mitani").

Mitani also does not make up for the deficiencies of Young as discussed above.

Also, the inventor notes that Mitani does not disclose curing ultraviolet ray curable ink for ink jet by an ultraviolet ray. Therefore, does not disclose the structure of the present invention and is not related.

The USPTO also respectfully rejects dependent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Chieng (U.S. Patent No. 4,978,969) ("Chieng").

Chieng also does not make up for the deficiencies of Young as discussed above.

Chieng also does not disclose nor suggest of using a ultraviolet ray irradiating device provided with a plurality of ultraviolet ray sources respectively emitting a plurality of ultraviolet rays of a plurality of light emitting wavelength peaks different from one another.

KOY-0025
10/731,278

II. Conclusion.

Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130. Please contact the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner including via telephone if convenient for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

/Daniel P. Lent/
Daniel P. Lent

(s-signature 37 CFR §1.4)

Registration No. 44,867
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: March 7, 2006

KOY-0025
10/731,278

7